Previous references. 1886-1887
~~191~~
(Sep. Rev.)

Later references.

C R File No. 3 of 86-87
Serial Nos. (-2

(9)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—2

Major ~~Part~~ B. for

SUBJECT

Claim of Inamdars to Toddy Revenue of Garkehally &c:—

Sl 1. From the D.C. Bangalore:-
No: 488. 10.9.86

Submits copy of memo together with his orders thereon in connection with the dispute to the right of Toddy Revenue of Sogal & Garkehally villages.

Sl 2. to — do —
No: 5754/313. 20.11.86.

States that the above has been recorded.

Th. S. Krishnarao

Endorsed

B. Ramachandra Rao

14.9.10

G. R. S. 58

GPB—4,000—4-7-11

(General Serial No. 29.)

1886-87.

43-31
15 SEP 86
439
DEMI OFFICIAL MYSORE.

From The Dy Commissioner Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Dewan Chief of Mysore.

Dated 15th September 1886.

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & Ver: Papers

General No. 20 / No. 488 } 1886-87.

I have the honor to submit, herewith for the information of Government, copy of Memo together with the orders of the undersigned thereon, in connection with the dispute to the right of Toddy Revenue of Sogal and Garkehally villages in the

SECTION SR
FILE No. 30 86-87
SERIAL No. 1
15-9-86

Any refee
13/9/
Lr
Submitted
888
15-9-86

Ld:
A question has been put how to enforce payment in such cases — by the Collector
That is pending —
17/9/86 —
Closepet Amildars
Urgee ebo 15 & 1 with enclosures

No: Kat 1 & 2
pending: The Dy Com has ordered
Collect the amount due
Recovrie & remit — the
order Marken Jama
recently issued
the Mysore Dy Com

Refd to Bangalore
the receiving Dy Com is
Recorder

11/11/86
drafted
19/11

15/9
19/11

Closepet Taluk.

2. The Vernacular proceedings on the subject are also submitted for perusal and obliging return.

A. Cummins
Dy. Commissioner

Mill

Memo-

1 The Survamanyandar of Sogala and Garkahalli villages in the Virupachipur Hobli of the Closepet Taluk, complained that she was leasing the Toddy farm of these villages independent of the Government Renters; but since the issue of Government order that Inamdars should in no case be permitted to draw Toddy and sell the same to the injury of the Government monopoly, she leased the farm to the Government Renters for three years Vis- -hu 1881-82, Chetthabhanu 1882-83, and Swabhanu 1883/84 for Rs: 1000/ a year. The term of the lease ex- -pired by the end of March 1884. The Government Renters have not taken up the lease for the subsequent years, but kept the matter in unnecessary correspondence

thus causing loss to the Inamdar. The Inamdar prays that she may be allowed to lease the farm to any others than the Government Renters as before. The Amildar to whom the matter was referred for enquiry, reports that long correspondence on the subject has passed between the Inamdar and Renters. The former claimed Rs: 1000/. a year for the lease, and the latter offered Rs: 500/. a year. The Contractors decline to pay the amount demanded on the ground that the fodder produce at present is not so productive as it was during the preceding years, and they have already sustained loss by not realizing the amount paid by them, and the amount they now offer is fair and they are

willing to pay that sum to the Inamdar from the date of taking over the Area to their possession

2 The Sub Division Officer submitted the case for the orders of the Dy Commissioner with a recommendation that the sum claimed by the Inamdar is fair The Dy Commissioner, thereupon, in pursuance of the instructions conveyed in Devan's Proceedings No. 45-33/190 dated 30th August 1881, ordered that the contractors should pay the average receipts derived by the Inamdar under this head during the last 5 years (1885 to

3 The Toddy Contractors state that the sum fixed by the Dy Commissioner is also large when compared with the present Government Contract amount. The Contract

amount when the said Proceedings was issued was small and now they pay double the amount. If Toddy farm of Inam villages is to be taken over by the Contractors preference is given to such Toddy Topes of Inam villages that are nearer to groves from which Toddy is at present supplied, and also pay double the amount of the lease after defraying the cost of Tapping &c., but the Toddy farm in dispute is not so, and there are infact very few consumers in this part. The Toddy groves of these villages do not pay the Contractors sufficient amount to meet the demand of the Inamdar. Considering that the Inamdar was in receipt of large sum heretofore from this source and she

and she may not be subjected to any loss, the Contractors say that they offer Rs: 500/. which the Inamdar declines to accept, consequently arrangements have been made for the supply of Foddy from other groves to the Vendors.

4 The Contractors take this opportunity to bring to the notice of the Dy Commissioner that the Amildar has taken great care in the interests of the Inamdar and has personally interfered in the matter to settle the dispute, having no regard whatever to the loss which the Government Contractors will be subjected to, if they take up the farm for the amount claimed by the Inamdar. But th

could not bring the Inamdar to any settlement. The Amildar in reply to this states that he had no necessity to interfere in the matter and what the Contractors say is false. When they came to the Taluk for the purpose of inspecting the date groves of the Inam villages or other, requested him to send for the Inamdar's Agent to ascertain some information in connection with the toddy farm, he has complied with their request and rendered necessary help as they are Government Contractors.

5 The Contractors add that they are not bound to take up the lease, which is not profitable to them. If the Dy Commissioner deems that the Inamdar should

not be put to loss, however, the Contractors are not willing to pay more than Rs: 500/ a year

6 The Inamdar states that the sum offered by the Contractors is a great loss to them, and they once proposed to pay Rs: 800/ and even this sum was refused by the Inamdar. Formerly the Contractors have paid Rs: 1000/ a year and now they could realize more than that sum as the groves are in a better and improving state. The Inamdar prays that the farm may be opened to competition and the highest bid fetched may be ordered to be paid by the Contractors. If this is not feasible, the Inamdar may be allowed to draw and vend toddy independently in their villages.

7 There are about 8534 date

trees in the Inam villages. Of these 700 are fit to be tapped. The income from these trees is fairly estimated at Rs. 1317/. a year.

Order

The Government have ordered the Contractors to pay the average for 5 years. This amounts to Rs. 885/. They must pay this to the Inamdar without any further delay. If they have anything further to urge they can appeal against this order. But they must pay first. The longer they delay the more arrears they will have to pay.

Orders to Contractors and Inamdars also send Proceedings to Government for information.

D/26th August 86. "Copy" /Signed/ A.W. Macintire
Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

A.W. Macintire
Dy Commissioner.

ad: —

Docket No. 488 of the
th September 1886 from
e Deputy Commissioner,
angalore District, sub-
mitting for information
by of a Memo: together
ith the orders passed
y him in connection
ith the dispute to the
ight of toddy Revenue
f Sogal & Gankehalli
~~Villages~~ Suvvanangeru
Villages in the Closepett
Taluk.

No 5754 of 20/11/86
3/3

Order thereon.

The decision of the
Deputy Commissioner
is recorded.

Mr
Under Secty

To Mr Dy Commr: Bangalore
returning Vernacular papers.